

Certified Personnel Evaluation Systems Educator Advisory Panel

Meeting Information

Date: May 3, 2018

Location: Natrona County School District #1 in Casper

Time: 9 a.m. - 3 p.m.

Meeting Purpose: Get panel oriented to work for the next year. Start digging in to Chapter 29.

Panel Members: Brad LaCroix, **Brian Redmond**, Christina Mills, Clint Travert, **Dustin Hunt**, Glen Suppes, Holly Voorhees-Carmical, Jean Chrotoski, Jeff Brewster, Jenefer Pasqua, Joel Dvorak, Julie Shanley, Liesl Sisson, Linda Wolfskill, Marie Puryear, Michael Jennings, Michelle Rooks, Robyn Heth, **Teresa Chaulk**, Teresa Ross, **Tom Sasche**, Tracy Ragland, Verba Echols, Wanda Maloney

WDE: Laurel Ballard, Shelley Hamel, Brent Bacon, Megan Degenfelder, Robin Grandpre

REL: Josh Stewart, Ceri Dean, **Mckenzie Haines**, Jeanette Joyce

FLP: Amy Starzynski, **Aunnie Johnson**

NCCC: Susan Lopez

Facilitator: Joe Simpson

*Names in blue attended virtually

| Time | Lead | Agenda Item |
|----------------|-------------|---|
| 9 - 9:30 a.m. | Joe | Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Icebreaker |
| 9:30 - 10 a.m. | Laurel | Overview of Committee Work and Outcomes |
| 10 a.m. - Noon | FLP/Laurel | Intro into Chapter 29 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where we are today - Statute overview - Feedback from AG |
| Noon - 1 p.m. | On your own | Lunch |
| 1-2:30 p.m. | REL | Evaluation System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who should be included in the system? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pros/Cons - How do we move forward with evaluation of defined groups? |

| | | |
|---------------|-----|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/statemodevaluationsystem |
| 2:30 - 3 p.m. | Joe | <p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards <p>Closing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - +/- - Next Meeting June (Monthly) - Complete Doodle Poll |

Notes:

All meeting documents can be accessed [here](#).

Welcome and introductions

Overview

We have to create a rules and regulations to the State Board around this evaluation system. We will go through the relevant statutes. There is a separate group handling the leader evaluations. We will spend a lot of time making recommendations and create the Chapter 29 rules. We are glad that we have done the leader evaluations, because we led a lot through that process. It gives us a great starting point. We will end up with Chapter 29 rules and guidance documents that will help districts.

We will ask you to share this information out with your constituents. We are working on a webpage for those not on this committee. We have a tight timeline. We need to attempt to get the Chapter 29 rules complete by July 2019. If we can't do that we will have to do emergency rules.

When you leave today we want you to have a strong understanding of the statutes that impact this work. We will also spend time today talking about who we are including in the evaluation system. We have to attach student achievement to the evaluation system per statute. We will also start working on what a comprehensive evaluation system includes.

Review of the [Team Charter](#).

Statute

Intro into Chapter 29 and related statute by looking at this [document](#).

The statue gives us the basic requirements of what needs to be included in Chapter 29. Chapter 29 addresses both Certified Evaluation System Personel (CPES) leader and teacher evaluation systems. This group will only be looking at the CPES teacher evaluations. We sometimes have to try and figure out what the legislature intended when writing the statute and make sure it is educationally important. We want to make sure that we make the rules fit with in the statute but also include best practices.

The main statute that relates to this panel is W.S. 21-2-304(b)(xv). However, we have to piece together the intent of the legislature but pulling information from other statute. When there are gaps that are not addresses in statute, the rules stand in place of the statute. This can give the panel some flexibility.

There are two models allowed per statute, the state model and the state model with refinements. The state model can be refined in the district as long as the statewide system integrity is not compromised. This group will have to set those parameters.

The legislature talked about accountability in two phases, the first was the school and the second was teacher. We have been struggling with which phase is addressed in the statute. As we look at some of these pieces, we need to think about if a school is coming out as not effective but all the teachers are highly effective, there has to be some flags raised. There is in statute that the system must include reasonable opportunity for mentoring and professional development of those educators performing unsatisfactory to improve instruction and student achievement.

Question - when talking about the WYTOPP for the data with student achievement, if using the state testing results aren't due until Aug. This means that districts will always be a year behind. This is one of those areas where we need to find a way to create a system that works with in that statute, but may address other data options for districts to utilize.

Some districts evaluate teachers multiple times per year, others evaluate based on behaviors, and some evaluate contracted personnel differently. Specialists sometimes use different data from those that are in the classroom. A district has added their own best practices in addition to the evaluation system that they are using. We may need to identify

specific issues around what data and measures that we think we need to use. The legislature may want us to use those data systems such as WYTOPP since we are paying for them at the state level. However, timing for this data could be problematic.

The statute allows for the state system and the state system with refinements. However, with the educator evaluation systems there is no allowance for an alternative system. The AG has stated that because there is no allowance, that they meant for there not to be. Therefore, there is ability for districts to have an alternative leader system, but cannot have an alternative system for educators. This group will have to define what a refinement is, how much refinement can be allowed, rubrics, and additional items that are included in the system. We are already getting feedback that districts are not super happy about not having the ability to have their own system.

The legislature has not been very interested in picking this section up in the last session due to all the budget concerns, but they have been very firm on holding schools and districts accountable.

Comments from panel:

- Would like the state to converge on Danielson model
- Training for evaluation using similar lens
- Need standardization of training for consistency
- Needs assessment of what is doing and working in the state and use what is going on from other states - learning from others
- Group edit on rubrics
- Like the idea that this body will give direction
- Want to make wise decisions when purchasing and dollars are involved
- Concern around timing requirements
- Data may be given outside of timeline
- No psychometric requirements around District Assessment Systems
- Who are the teachers
- Concern about Title 1, SPED, alternative
- What about gifted teachers
- Thinking about teacher practices they wanted teachers to display
- Purpose of eval is to coach the teachers
- Focusing on PLC models

21-3-11(a)(xix) - Evaluations should serve as a basis for improvement of instruction, enhancement of curriculum program, implementation, measures of both individual teacher performance and professional growth and development and the performance level of all teacher within the school district. We would add the mentoring piece into this section. Do we need more of a focus on coaching? Are these items different from district to district?

As the district picks priorities, will systems support that district decision? Currently, other models can be adjusted to fit district needs. The most important coaching can be working with a colleague to learn from their peers.

How is professional growth being measured currently? It can depend on the system that the district is using. Cycles of inquiry can be used by the teachers on how they want to grow. All of these options are very time consuming. There are conversations at the beginning of the year with the teachers to set expectation on what they will be measured. Most also include student data. This can be used to rate the strategies that the teachers are using in the classroom.

Why have only one system that all districts have to use? In 2011, there was a big push on phase 1 accountability and there was a problem seeing the results that the legislators wanted to see. This is when this started, and really hasn't changed much since then.

Do you look at the performance level of all teachers within the district for planning or improvement currently? Districts look for trends to help plan PD in those areas that need improvement. Some don't look at an overall across the district, but ask principals what they are seeing and how they are going to address the needs.

What documentation is needed for dismissal, suspension and termination? If someone is rated as unsatisfactory, they get put on an improvement plan and a timeline, and if they don't improve within that time they can be dismissed. Justification and documentation has to be collected throughout this process so that it can be defended in a hearing.

What timeline is being used now? In general, April 15 is when all evaluations need to be completed. Statewide assessments are not usually used because it is not available at the time of the evaluations. District level assessments are usually used because it is available and are often have multiple data points throughout the year. PLC teams sometimes choose data that will make themselves more important.

How do you use data for those teachers outside of the core content areas? Some districts create assessments and measures that students need to be able to do to be successful. In some districts the electives are a big challenge. Sometimes these electives are only once or twice a week, so that time especially K-5 can be challenging.

It was mentioned that evaluations are confidential, however, data is not confidential. So a teacher can be identified by the data. An example is that Mr. Smith has 43% of his students proficient. This is not confidential and can be shared. This can be especially challenging in small districts.

Who should be included in the Evaluation System?

Review of the Colorado [rubrics](#).

How are virtual education teachers included? How do you do a walk through? What if they are out of state? What about alternative school educators?

The leader system includes principals, assistant principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents and other district leaders. We will not have to include these folks in the educator evaluation systems.

Remember that we have to attach student data to those that we are going to address in this system. We need to define who we want to include in this system.

- Should we narrow down based on classroom instruction?
- Suggestion to narrow down based on those that have more than 16 students or more.
- Some of the positions listed on the CO rubrics, there is only one for the entire district.
- If there is some type of certification, then there should be some type of evaluation. But how to apply academic data is the question.
- Maybe have similar standards but have different rubrics for the librarian, counselors, etc.
- Write rubric broad enough to be cover all positions?
- There may need to be different rubrics for K-2, and then 3-12 based on the abilities of the students at that age.

- If we limit to just teachers that wouldn't limit districts from using this system for other positions.

List to potentially be included:

- Teachers (pre-K to 12)
- ~~Library Media Tech~~
- ~~Librarian~~
- (Certified) Tutors
- ~~Para~~
- ~~Teachers on Special Assignment~~
- ~~Instructional Facilitators~~
- Special Ed
- Virtual Education
- ESL
- Title I (elementary)
- ~~Teacher of Record (602)~~
- ~~Certificate of Attendance Teachers~~
- ~~Counselors~~
- ~~Audiologists~~
- ~~Occupational therapists~~
- ~~Physical therapists~~
- ~~Nurse~~
- ~~School orientation and mobility specialists~~
- ~~School psychologist~~
- ~~Social worker~~
- ~~Speech language pathologist~~
- Specialty teachers (art, music, homebound, PE, CTE, etc.)

To be included in this system we think they need to be providing direct academic instruction and be certified under PTSB.

Next Steps

- How do we move forward with evaluation of defined groups?
 - REL will bring examples of this for the next meeting.
- Standards
 - REL will bring some different models examples for the next meeting.

-
- Look at what system standards are being used in Wyoming districts right now.

Closing

- Positives
 - Agenda
 - Afternoon conversation was good
 - Review of all of the statute, ground rules
 - Prep work - helped
 - Small group conversations
- Negative
 - Cold room
 - Set-up closer with less tables
 - Virtual audio was hard from time to time when lots of people were talking